arXiv:math/0702665v1 [math.SP] 22 Feb 2007

Sharp Semiclassical Estimates for the Number of Eigenvalues Below a Degenerate Critical Level

Lech Zielinski
LMPA, Centre Mi-Voix, Université du Littoral, B.P. 699, 62228 Calais Cedex, France
e-mail Lech.Zielinski@lmpa.univ-littoral.fr and IMJ, Mathématiques, case 7012,
Université Paris 7, 2 Place Jussieu, 75251 Paris Cedex 05, France

Abstract: We consider the semiclassical asymptotic behaviour of the number of eigenvalues smaller than E for elliptic operators in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We describe a method of obtaining remainder estimates related to the volume of the region of the phase space in which the principal symbol takes values belonging to the intervals $[E';\ E'+h]$, where E' is close to E. This method allows us to derive sharp remainder estimates $O(h^{1-d})$ for a class of symbols with critical points and non-smooth coefficients.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): 35P20

Keywords: semiclassical approximation, eigenvalue asymptotics, critical energy

1 Introduction

We assume that for $h \in]0;\ h_0]$ the differential operators $A_h = a(x, hD, h)$ are self-adjoint in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and the symbol $a(x,\xi,h) = \sum_{0\le n\le N} h^n a_n(x,\xi)$ is sufficiently regular. If $E \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$E < \liminf_{|x|+|\xi|\to\infty} a_0(x,\xi) \tag{1.1}$$

and h_0 is small enough, then the spectrum of A_h is discrete in $]-\infty;\ E]$ and it is natural to ask whether the counting function $\mathcal{N}(A_h, E)$ (i.e. the number of eigenvalues smaller than E counted with their multiplicities) satisfies the semiclassical asymptotic formula

$$\mathcal{N}(A_h, E) = (2\pi h)^{-d} c_E + O(h^{\mu-d}) \text{ as } h \to 0, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mu > 0$ and

$$c_E = \int_{a_0(x,\xi)<E} dx d\xi = \mathrm{vol}\,\{(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} :\ a_0(x,\xi) < E\}. \tag{1.2$'$}$$

The most powerful approach of studying semiclassical asymptotics has its origin in the microlocal analysis of L. Hörmander [12]. Since the first papers of J. Chazarain [7] and B. Helffer, D. Robert [10], this approach has been used in numerous works, cf. the monographs [9], [15], [21]. A basic result says that (1.2) holds with $\mu = 1$ if E is not a critical value of a_0 [i.e. $a_0(x,\xi) = E \Rightarrow \nabla a_0(x,\xi) \neq 0$] and we refer to the papers T. Paul, A. Uribe [20] and M. Combescure, J. Ralston, D. Robert [8], giving more precise estimates in relation with the periodic orbits of the Hamiltonian flow of a_0.

In this paper we investigate the case when the critical set

$$\mathcal{C}_E^{a_0} = \{(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} :\ a_0(x,\xi) = E \text{ and } \nabla a_0(x,\xi) = 0\} \tag{1.3}$$

is not empty and we consider elliptic operators with non-smooth coefficients. Below we enumerate different methods and works treating this problem.

– The analysis of oscillatory integrals. If $\mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}$ is a smooth manifold and the Hessian matrix of a_0 is transversely non-degenerate, then the semiclassical spectral asymptotics can be obtained from the analysis described in the paper of R. Brummelhuis, T. Paul, A. Uribe [2]. This approach was developed to study the contribution of periodic orbits under some geometrical assumptions on the flow (cf. D. Khuat-Duy [18], B. Camus [3, 4]) and recent results of B. Camus [5, 6] concern the case of a totally degenerate critical point of a_0. The oscillatory integrals being degenerate in the case of a degenerate Hessian matrix, the principal difficulty of this approach appears in suitable generalizations of the stationary phase method.

– The multiscale analysis developed by V. Ivrii [15]. This method was extended to treat elliptic operators with non-smooth coefficients in the paper V. Ivrii [17] (cf. also V. Ivrii [16] and M. Bronstein, V. Ivrii [1]).

– The approximative spectral projector method of M. A. Shubin, V. A. Tulovskii [22]. The application of this method to our problem was described in the monograph of S. Z. Levendorskii [19] and it gives remainder estimates involving the volume of suitable regions determined by a_0 in the phase space valid without any additional assumptions on the Hessian matrix of a_0. After the improvement of L. Hörmander [13], for evry $\mu < \frac{2}{3}$ one can find a constant $C_\mu > 0$ such that for $h \in]0;\ h_0]$ one has

$$\Big|\mathcal{N}(A_h, E) - (2\pi h)^{-d} c_E\Big| \leq C_\mu\, h^{-d} \mathcal{R}_E^{a_0}(h^\mu) \tag{1.4}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_E^{a_0}(h^\mu) = \mathrm{vol}\,\{(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} :\ |a_0(x,\xi) - E| \leq h^\mu\}.$$

– The method of integrations by parts used in [23, 26]. This method allowed us to show that the estimates (1.4) are still valid for $\mu < 1$.

In this paper we show how to generalize the method of [26] to recover estimates with $\mu = 1$. Our aim is to show that for every $\varepsilon > 0$ it is possible to find a constant $C_\varepsilon > 0$ such that for $h \in]0;\ h_0]$ one has

$$\Big|\mathcal{N}(A_h, E) - (2\pi h)^{-d} c_E\Big| \leq C_\varepsilon\, h^{-d} \mathcal{R}_E^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h), \tag{1.5}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_E^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h) = h + \sup_{E' \in [E - h^{1-\varepsilon};\ E + h^{1-\varepsilon}]} \mathrm{vol}\,\{(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} :\ |a_0(x,\xi) - E'| \leq h\}.$$

Using a regularization procedure similarly as in [24, 26] we can show that these estimates are valid for elliptic operators with coefficients which have second order derivatives Hölder continuous.

It is easy to see that one can always find constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$\mathrm{vol}\,\{(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} :\ |a_0(x,\xi) - E'| \leq h\} \leq C h^c \tag{1.6}$$

and the asymptotic formula (1.2) holds with $\mu = 1$ if additional properties of a_0 ensure the estimate (1.6) with $c = 1$ for $E' \in [E - h^{1-\varepsilon};\ E + h^{1-\varepsilon}]$.

The main part of this paper is devoted to the proof of a microlocal trace formula in the region

$$\{(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} :\ |\nabla a_0(x,\xi)| \geq h^{\delta_0}\} \tag{1.7}$$

where $\delta_0 \in]0; 1/2[$. This result allows us to derive the asymptotic formula (1.5) under the assumption that the Hessian matrix of a_0 is of rank ≥ 2.

Indeed, it is easy to see (cf. Section 6) that the last assumption ensures the fact that the volume of

$$\{(x,\xi)\in \mathbb{R}^{2d}:\ |\nabla a_0(x,\xi)|\le h^{\delta_0}\} \tag{1.7$'$}$$

is $o(h)$ if $\frac{1}{2}-\delta_0$ is small enough and the corresponding contribution can be included in the right hand side of (1.5) due to (1.6). The next paper [27] will present a trace formula in the region (1.7′), completing the proof of (1.5) without any hypotheses on the Hessian of a_0.

Assume $0<r_0<1$. We write $a\in C_b^{2+r_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if and only if the function $a:\mathbb{R}^d\to\mathbb{C}$ satisfies the following conditions

$$\partial^\alpha a\in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)\ \text{ if }\ |\alpha|\le 2, \tag{1.8}$$

$$|\partial^\alpha a(x)-\partial^\alpha a(y)|\le C|x-y|^{r_0}\ \text{ if }\ |\alpha|=2,\ \ x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{1.8$'$}$$

Let $m_0\in\mathbb{N}$ and for $\nu,\bar\nu\in\mathbb{N}^d$, $|\nu|,|\bar\nu|\le m_0$ let $a_{\nu,\bar\nu}=a_{\bar\nu,\nu}\in C_{\mathrm{b}}^{2+r_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be real-valued and such that

$$\sum_{|\nu|=|\bar\nu|=m_0} a_{\nu,\bar\nu}(x)\xi^{\nu+\bar\nu}\ge c_0|\xi|^{2m_0}\qquad (x,\xi\in\mathbb{R}^d) \tag{1.9}$$

holds for a certain constant $c_0>0$. Let $\mathcal{A}_h$ be the quadratic form

$$\mathcal{A}_h[\varphi,\psi]=\sum_{|\nu|,|\bar\nu|\le m_0}(a_{\nu,\bar\nu}(hD)^\nu\varphi,\,(hD)^{\bar\nu}\psi), \tag{1.10}$$

where $\varphi,\psi\in C_0^{m_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $(hD)^\nu=(-ih)^{|\nu|}\frac{\partial^\nu}{\partial x^\nu}$ and $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the scalar product of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Due to (1.9), $\mathcal{A}_h$ is bounded from below and its closure defines a self-adjoint operator A_h. Usually A_h is expressed formally as

$$A_h=\sum_{|\nu|,|\bar\nu|\le m_0}(hD)^{\bar\nu}\left(a_{\nu,\bar\nu}(x)(hD)^\nu\right). \tag{1.10$'$}$$

Moreover we denote

$$a_0(x,\xi)=\sum_{|\nu|,|\bar\nu|\le m_0}a_{\nu,\bar\nu}(x)\xi^{\nu+\bar\nu}. \tag{1.11}$$

Then we have

Theorem 1.1 *Let* $a_{\nu,\bar{\nu}} \in C_b^{2+r_0}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *be such that* (1.9) *holds and let* A_h *be self-adjoint operators in* $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *defined by* (1.10). *Let* $E \in \mathbb{R}$ *be such that* (1.1) *holds (with* a_0 *given by* (1.11)*) and let* $h_0 > 0$ *be small enough.*

a) If $h \in]0;\ h_0]$ *then the spectrum of* A_h *is discrete in* $]-\infty;\ E]$.

b) If the dimension $d \geq 3$, *then for every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *one can find a constant* $C_\varepsilon > 0$ *such that* (1.5) *holds for* $h \in]0;\ h_0]$.

In this paper we show

Theorem 1.2 *Let* A_h, a_0 *and* E *satisfy the assumptions of Theorem* 1.1. *Assume moreover that the rank of the Hessian matrix of* a_0 *is greater or equal* 2 *at every point of the critical set* $\mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}$. *If the dimension* $d \geq 2$, *then for every* $\varepsilon > 0$ *one can find a constant* $C_\varepsilon > 0$ *such that* (1.5) *holds for* $h \in]0;\ h_0]$.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 presented in this paper will be used in [27] to derive Theorem 1.1.

Remark. More general behaviour of coefficients can be considered for x such that $a_0(x, \xi) \geq E_0 > E$ holds for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In particular we have assumed that the coefficients $a_{\nu,\bar{\nu}}$ are bounded for sake of simplicity, but the same results hold for tempered variations models (cf. B. Helffer, D. Robert [11]). us

Plan of the proof. We begin Section 2 by a description of the regularization of non-smooth coefficients. It allows us to define the operators P_h with smooth coefficients and Theorems 1.1, 1.2, can be deduced from a suitable microlocal trace formula for P_h. The proof of the trace formula is based on the analysis of the evolution group $\exp(itP_h/h)$ and its approximation is described in Section 3.

At the beginning of Section 4 we apply the integration by parts to check the correct trace asymptotics of the approximation constructed in Section 3. It remains to control the difference between $\exp(itP_h/h)$ and its approximation. Our reasoning is devided in two steps. In Section 4 we observe that for every $\bar{\varepsilon} > 0$ one can obtain suitable estimates for $|t| \leq h^{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ similarly as in [26]. In Section 5 we use a property of the wave front propagation to show that the contribution of the region (1.7) is negligible if $|t| \geq h^{\bar{\varepsilon}}$ and $\bar{\varepsilon} + \delta_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. In Section 6 we complete the proof estimating the volume of the region (1.7′).

2 Regularized problem

2.1 Description of smooth operators

We assume $\frac{1}{2+r_0} < \delta_0 < \frac{1}{2}$. Let $\gamma \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be such that $\int \gamma(x)\,dx = 1$ and $\int x^\alpha \gamma(x)\,dx = 0$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ satisfying $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq 2$. We introduce h-dependent regularization of coefficients

$$a_{\nu,\bar{\nu},h}(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} a_{\nu,\bar{\nu}}(y)\gamma(h^{-\delta_0}(x-y))\,h^{-d\delta_0}\,dy \tag{2.1}$$

and define formally self-adjoint differential operators

$$P_h^\pm = \sum_{|\nu|,|\bar{\nu}|\leq m_0} (hD)^\nu \left(a_{\nu,\bar{\nu},h}(x)(hD)^{\bar{\nu}}\right) \pm h(I - h^2\Delta)^{m_0}. \tag{2.2}$$

We write $P_h^\pm$ in the standard form

$$P_h^\pm = \sum_{|\nu|\leq 2m_0} p_{\nu,h}^\pm(x)(hD)^\nu \tag{2.3}$$

and we use the standard notation $P_h^\pm = p_h^\pm(x, hD)$ with

$$p_h^\pm(x,\xi) = \sum_{|\nu|\leq 2m_0} p_{\nu,h}^\pm(x)\xi^\nu. \tag{2.4}$$

In Section 7 we check the following properties :

Lemma 2.1 *Let a_0, A_h be as in Theorem* 1.1 *and $P_h^\pm$, $p_h^\pm$ as above.*
(a) *The estimates*

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta p_h^\pm(x,\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta}(1 + h^{(2+r_0-|\alpha|)\delta_0})(1+|\xi|)^{2m_0-|\beta|} \tag{2.5}$$

hold for every $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$ and

$$|\partial_x^\alpha \partial_\xi^\beta (a_0 - p_h^\pm)(x,\xi)| \leq C_{\alpha,\beta}(h + h^{(2+r_0-|\alpha|)\delta_0})(1+|\xi|)^{2m_0-|\beta|} \tag{2.6}$$

hold if $|\alpha| \leq 2$.
(b) *Let $h_0 > 0$ be small enough and consider $h \in]0;\ h_0]$. Then $A_h^\pm$ and the self-adjoint realizations of $P_h^\pm$ have discrete spectrum in $]-\infty;\ E]$. Moreover the inequalities*

$$P_h^- \leq A_h \leq P_h^+ \tag{2.7}$$

hold in the sense of quadratic forms (for $h \in]0;\ h_0]$).

We deduce (1.5) from suitable asymptotics for $P_h^{\pm}$, observing that (2.7) and the min-max principle ensure $\mathcal{N}(P_h^{+}, E) \le \mathcal{N}(A_h, E) \le \mathcal{N}(P_h^{-}, E)$. Further on we write P_h and p_h instead of $P_h^{\pm}$ and $p_h^{\pm}$.

2.2 Microlocalisation

Assume that $\Gamma_h \subset \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ for $h \in]0;\ h_0]$ and denote $\Gamma = (\Gamma_h)_{h\in]0;\, h_0]}$.
For $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta, \delta_1 \in [0;\ 1[$ satisfying $\delta + \delta_1 < 1$ we define $S^m_{\delta,\delta_1}(\Gamma)$ writing $b \in S^m_{\delta,\delta_1}(\Gamma)$ if and only if $b = (b_h)_{h\in]0;\, h_0]}$ is a family of smooth functions $b_h : \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that the estimates

$$\sup_{(x,\xi)\in\Gamma_h} |\partial_\xi^\alpha \partial_x^\beta b_h(x,\xi)| \le C_{\alpha,\beta} h^{-m-|\alpha|\delta-|\beta|\delta_1} \tag{2.8}$$

hold for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$. In the case $\delta = \delta_1$ we abbreviate $S^m_{\delta,\delta}(\Gamma) = S^m_\delta(\Gamma)$.
If $b = (b_h)_{h\in]0;\, h_0]} \in S^m_{\delta,\delta_1}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ (i.e. $\Gamma_h = \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ for all h), then writing

$$(B_h\varphi)(x) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} d\xi\, \mathrm{e}^{ix\xi/h} b_h(x,\xi) \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dy\, \mathrm{e}^{-iy\xi/h} \varphi(y)$$

for $\varphi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define the operators $B_h = b_h(x, hD) \in B(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ satisfying $||b_h(x, hD)|| \le Ch^{-m}$ [where $||\cdot||$ is the norm of the algebra of bounded operators $B(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$].

Let $\mathbb{1}_Z : \mathbb{R} \to \{0,\, 1\}$ be the characteristic function of the interval $Z \subset \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathbb{1}_Z(P_h)$ denotes the spectral projector of P_h on Z and

$$\mathcal{N}(P_h, E) = \operatorname{tr} \mathbb{1}_{]-\infty;\, E]}(P_h).$$

For a given $t_0 > 0$ we consider a standard mollifying of $\mathbb{1}_Z$ using a real valued pair function $\gamma_0 \in C_0^\infty([-t_0/2;\ t_0/2])$ and $\gamma_1 = \gamma_0 * \gamma_0$ such that $\gamma_1(0) = 1$. The inverse h-Fourier transform of γ_1, given by the formula

$$\tilde{\gamma}_h(\zeta) = (2\pi h)^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}} dt\, \gamma_1(t) \mathrm{e}^{it\zeta/h} \quad \text{for } \zeta \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{2.9}$$

defines a family of holomorphic functions satisfying $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \tilde{\gamma}_h(\lambda) d\lambda = \gamma_1(0) = 1$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_h(\lambda) > 0$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We denote

$$\tilde{f}_h^Z(\zeta) = \int_Z d\lambda\, \tilde{\gamma}_h(\zeta - \lambda) \tag{2.9'}$$

and in Section 7 we show the following result:

Lemma 2.2 *In order to show the asymptotic formula* (1.5) *it is sufficient to fix* $c > 0$ *and to prove that for every* $l \in S^0_{0,\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ *satisfying*

$$\operatorname{supp} l_h \subset \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : |a_0(v) - E| \leq c\} \tag{2.10}$$

one has the estimates

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} \tilde{f}^Z_h(P_h)L_h - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dv}{(2\pi h)^d} \tilde{f}^Z_h(\hat{p}_h(v)) l_h(v) \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \, h^{-d} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon, a_0}_{E_j}(h), \tag{2.11}$$

where $L_h = l_h(x, hD)$, $\hat{p}_h = \operatorname{Re} p_h$, $Z = [E_1;\ E_2] \subset [E - c;\ E + c]$ *and the constant* C_ε *is independent of* E_1, E_2.

2.3 Partition of the phase space

Further on $\bar{C}, \bar{c} > 0$ are constants and we denote

$$\hat{\Gamma}(\bar{C}h^{\delta_0}) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : \ |\nabla a_0(v)| \leq \bar{C}h^{\delta_0}\}, \tag{2.12}$$

$$\check{\Gamma}(\bar{c}h^{\delta_0}) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : \ |\nabla a_0(v)| > \bar{c}h^{\delta_0}\}. \tag{2.12$'$}$$

Using (1.1) we can find $\overline{\Gamma}_0$ being a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ such that

$$\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : |a_0(v) - E| \leq 2c\} \subset \overline{\Gamma}_0, \tag{2.13}$$

where the constant $c > 0$ is fixed small enough. We will consider (2.11) with $l_h = \hat{l}_h + \check{l}_h$, where

$$\operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h \subset \hat{\Gamma}(\bar{C}h^{\delta_0}) \cap \overline{\Gamma}_0, \quad \operatorname{supp} \check{l}_h \subset \check{\Gamma}(\bar{c}h^{\delta_0}) \cap \overline{\Gamma}_0 \tag{2.14}$$

and moreover we introduce an auxiliary cut-off function $\tilde{l} \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\tilde{l} = 1$ on $\overline{\Gamma}_0$. Further on we denote

$$\check{L}_h = \check{l}_h(x, hD), \quad \tilde{L}_h = \tilde{l}_h(x, hD), \tag{2.15}$$

where $\check{l}$, $\tilde{l}$ are as above. Then we have $||\check{L}_h(I - \tilde{L}^*_h)||_{\text{tr}} = O(h^\infty)$, where $|| \cdot ||_{\text{tr}}$ denotes the trace class norm, $O(h^\infty)$ means that $O(h^m)$ holds for every $m \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\tilde{L}^*_h$ denotes the adjoint of $\tilde{L}_h$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Using moreover the trace cyclicity we obtain

$$\operatorname{tr} \check{L}_h \tilde{f}^Z_h(P_h) \, = \, \operatorname{tr} \check{L}_h \tilde{f}^Z_h(P_h) \tilde{L}^*_h \, + O(h^\infty)$$

and further on we keep the auxiliary cut-off $\tilde{L}_h^*$ to be sure that our analysis always concern operators of the trace class. We introduce

$$f_h^Z(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} d\lambda \, \mathrm{e}^{-it\lambda/h} \tilde{f}_h^Z(\lambda) = \gamma_1(t) \int_Z d\lambda \, \mathrm{e}^{-it\lambda/h}. \tag{2.16}$$

Then $\tilde{f}_h(\lambda) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{2\pi h} \, f_h^Z(t) \, \mathrm{e}^{it\lambda/h}$ and consequently

$$\mathrm{tr}\, \check{L}_h \tilde{f}_h(P_h) \tilde{L}_h^* \; = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{2\pi h} \, f_h(t) \, \mathrm{tr}\, \check{L}_h \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h} \tilde{L}_h^*. \tag{2.17}$$

We will prove

Proposition 2.3 *Assume that* $t_0, \kappa > 0$ *are small enough,* $\varepsilon > 0$ *and* $\check{L}_h$*,* $\tilde{L}_h$ *are given by* (2.15)*. Then for every* $\bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}$ *one can find the operators* $Q_{\bar{N}}^h(t) \in B(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ *such that*

$$\sup_{-t_0 \le t \le t_0} |\, \mathrm{tr}\, (Q_{\bar{N}}^h(t) - \check{L}_h \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h}) \tilde{L}_h^* \,| \;\le\; C_{\bar{N}} h^{\bar{N}\kappa - 5d - 1} \tag{2.18}$$

and one has the estimates

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{2\pi h} \, f_h^Z(t) \, \mathrm{tr}\, Q_{\bar{N}}^h(t) \tilde{L}_h^* \; - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dv}{(2\pi h)^d} \, \check{l}_h(v) \tilde{f}_h^Z(\hat{p}_h(v)) \right|$$

$$\le C_\varepsilon \, h^{-d} \sum_{1 \le j \le 2} \mathcal{R}_{E_j}^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h), \tag{2.19}$$

where $\hat{p}_h = \mathrm{Re}\, p_h$*,* $Z = [E_1;\; E_2] \subset [E - c;\; E + c]$ *and* C_ε *is independent of* E_1*,* E_2*.*

Using Proposition 2.3 we find that (2.11) holds if l_h, L_h are replaced by $\check{l}_h$, $\check{L}_h$. Indeed, we have $|f_h^Z(t)| \le C|\gamma_1(t)|$ and $\mathrm{supp}\, \gamma_1 \subset [-t_0;\; t_0]$, hence we can replace $\check{L}_h \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h}$ by $Q_{\bar{N},h}(t)$ in (2.17) with an error $O(h^{\bar{N}\kappa - 5d - 1})$.

The construction of $Q_{\bar{N}}^h(t)$ is presented in Section 3 and Proposition 2.3 is proved in Sections 4-5. At the end of this section we introduce classes of symbols describing properties of $\check{l}_h$ and $\hat{l}_h$.

2.4 Classes of symbols $S_{(0)}^m$

Further on δ_0, $\overline{\Gamma}_0$ are fixed as before, we fix $\bar{C} > 1$, we denote

$$\hat{\Gamma}_h = \hat{\Gamma}(\bar{C} h^{\delta_0}), \qquad \check{\Gamma}_h = \mathbb{R}^{2d} \setminus \hat{\Gamma}_h = \check{\Gamma}(\bar{C} h^{\delta_0}) \tag{2.20}$$

and we write $\hat{\Gamma} = (\hat{\Gamma}_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]}$, $\check{\Gamma} = (\check{\Gamma}_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]}$.

For $m \in \mathbb{R}$ we define $S^m_{(0)}$ writing $b \in S^m_{(0)}$ if and only if $b = (b_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]} \in S^m_{0,\delta_0}(\check{\Gamma}) \cap S^m_{\delta_0}(\hat{\Gamma})$ and $\operatorname{supp} b \subset \overline{\Gamma}_0$ (i.e. $\operatorname{supp} b_h \subset \overline{\Gamma}_0$ for every $h \in]0;\ h_0]$).

Lemma 2.4 *Let* $l \in S^0_{0,\delta_0}$ *satisfy* $\operatorname{supp} l \subset \overline{\Gamma}_0$. *Then there exist* $\check{l}, \hat{l} \in S^0_{(0)}$ *such that* $l = \hat{l} + \check{l}$, $\operatorname{supp} \hat{l} \subset \operatorname{supp} l$ *and* (2.14) *holds if* $\bar{c} > 0$ *is small enough.*

Proof. Let $\chi_0 \in C^\infty_0(]-1;\ 1[)$ satisfy $0 \le \chi_0 \le 1$ and $\chi_0 = 1$ on $[-\frac{1}{2};\ \frac{1}{2}]$. We define $\hat{\chi} \in S^0_{\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$ setting $\hat{\chi}_h(v) = \prod_{|\beta|=1} \chi_0(\partial^\beta \hat{p}_h(v) \cdot 2d/h^{\delta_0})$. Since

$$\nabla p_h(x,\xi) = \nabla a_0(x,\xi) + o(h^{\delta_0})(1 + |\xi|^{2m_0}) \tag{2.21}$$

due to (2.6) and a_0 is real valued, (2.21) still holds if we replace p_h by $\hat{p}_h$. However $\hat{\chi}_h(v) \neq 0$ implies $|\partial^\beta \hat{p}_h(v)| \cdot 2d/h^{\delta_0} \le 1$ if $|\beta| = 1$, hence we have $|\nabla a_0(v)| \le h^{\delta_0}(1 + o(1))$ if moreover $v \in \overline{\Gamma}_0$. Therefore setting $\hat{l} = l\hat{\chi}$ we obtain $\operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h \subset \hat{\Gamma}(\bar{C}h^{\delta_0})$ if $\bar{C} > 1$ and consequently $\hat{l} \in S^0_{(0)}$.

Next we define $\check{l} = l - \hat{l} \in S^0_{(0)}$. If $v \in \operatorname{supp} \check{l}$, then $\hat{\chi}_h(v) \neq 1$ and $|\partial^\beta p_h(v)| \cdot 2d/h^{\delta_0} \ge 1/2$ holds for a certain $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ with $|\beta| = 1$, hence $|\nabla p_h(v)| \ge h^{\delta_0}/(4d^2)$. Therefore $\operatorname{supp} \check{\chi}_h \subset \check{\Gamma}(\bar{c}h^{\delta_0})$ holds if $\bar{c} < 1/(4d^2)$. △.

3 Approximation of the evolution

3.1 Preliminaries

We write $\hat{p}_h = \operatorname{Re} p_h$ and we consider an approximation of $\check{L}_h \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h}$ in the form

$$Q^h_{\bar{N}}(t) = \Big(\mathrm{e}^{it\hat{p}_h/h} \sum_{0\le n\le \bar{N}} t^n q^\circ_{\bar{N},n,h}\Big)(x, hD), \tag{3.1}$$

where $q^\circ_{\bar{N},n,h}$ will be described in Proposition 3.3. We introduce formally

$$\tilde{Q}^h_{\bar{N}}(t) = \tfrac{d}{dt} Q^h_{\bar{N}}(t) - iQ^h_{\bar{N}}(t) P_h/h \tag{3.2}$$

and require $Q^h_{\bar{N}}(0) = \check{L}_h$, which allows us to express

$$Q^h_{\bar{N}}(t) - \check{L}_h \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h} = \int_0^t d\tau\, \tilde{Q}^h_{\bar{N}}(t-\tau) \mathrm{e}^{i\tau P_h/h}. \tag{3.3}$$

To investigate (3.2) in terms of symbols we introduce the notation

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar N} b)_h(t) = \mathrm{e}^{-it\hat p_h/h}\left(\partial_t(b_h(t)\mathrm{e}^{it\hat p_h/h}) - \sum_{|\alpha|\le\bar N}\frac{h^{|\alpha|-1}}{\alpha!\, i^{|\alpha|-1}}\partial_\xi^\alpha(b_h(t)\,\mathrm{e}^{it\hat p_h/h}\overline{\partial_x^\alpha p_h})\right) \tag{3.4}$$

if $(b_h(t))_{h\in]0;\,h_0]} \in S^m_{(0)}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

3.2 Classes of symbols $S^m_{(N)}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$

We use the induction with respect to $N \in \mathbb{N}$ in the following definition:
i) if $N = 0$ then $S^m_{(N)} = S^m_{(0)}$ was defined at the end of Section 2 ;
ii) we write $(b_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]} \in S^m_{(N+1)}$ if and only if

$$b_h(x,\xi) = b_{0,h}(x,\xi) + \sum_{|\beta|=1} h^{-1/2} b_{\beta,h}(x,\xi)\partial^\beta \hat p_h(x,\xi) \tag{3.5}$$

holds with some $(b_{\beta,h})_{h\in]0;\,h_0]} \in S^m_{(N)}$ for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$ satisfying $|\beta| \le 1$.
It is clear that $S^m_{(N)} \subset S^{m+N/2}_{(0)}$. Moreover $b \in S^m_{(N)}$ if and only if one can write

$$b(x,\xi) = \sum_{\{\beta\in\mathbb{N}^{2d}:\ |\beta|\le N\}} b_\beta(x,\xi) h^{-|\beta|/2}(\nabla\hat p(x,\xi))^\beta \tag{3.6}$$

with some symbols $b_\beta \in S^m_{(0)}$, where $\nabla\hat p(x,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and

$$(t_1,...,t_n)^{(\alpha_1,...,\alpha_n)} = \prod_{1\le j\le n} t_j^{\alpha_j} \ \text{ for } (t_1,...,t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n,\ (\alpha_1,...,\alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n.$$

Using this characterization we find

$$b \in S^m_{(N)},\ \tilde b \in S^{\tilde m}_{0,\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0) \Rightarrow b\tilde b \in S^{m+\tilde m}_{(N)}, \tag{3.7}$$

$$b \in S^m_{(N)},\ \tilde b \in S^{\tilde m}_{(\tilde N)} \Rightarrow b\tilde b \in S^{m+\tilde m}_{(N+\tilde N)}. \tag{3.8}$$

Lemma 3.1 (a) *If* $b \in S^m_{(N)}$ *then* $\partial^\alpha b \in S^{m+|\alpha|/2}_{(N)}$ *for every* $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$.
(b) *If* $b \in S^m_{(N+1)}$ *then* $\partial_{\xi_k} b \in S^{m+1/2}_{(N)}$ *for* $k \in \{1,...,d\}$.

Proof (a) The general statement follows by induction with respect to $|\alpha|$ and we consider only the case $|\alpha| = 1$. It is clear that the assertion holds for $N = 0$ and reasoning by induction we assume that the assertion holds for a given $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $b \in S^m_{(N+1)}$. Then (3.5) holds with $b_\beta \in S^m_{(N)}$, hence $\partial^\alpha b_\beta \in S^{m+1/2}_{(N)}$ if $|\alpha| = 1$. Due to (2.5) we have $\partial^{\alpha+\beta}\hat{p} \in S^0_{0,\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$ and writing

$$\partial^\alpha(b_\beta\, h^{-1/2}\partial^\beta\hat{p}) = b_\beta\, h^{-1/2}\partial^{\alpha+\beta}\hat{p} + \partial^\alpha b_\beta\, h^{-1/2}\partial^\beta\hat{p} \in S^{m+1/2}_{(N+1)}, \tag{3.9}$$

we obtain the assertion of Lemma 3.1(a) for $N+1$.

(b) We will show that for $k \in \{1, ..., d\}$, $|\alpha| = 1$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$b \in S^m_{(N)} \ \Rightarrow\ \partial_{\xi_k} b\, \partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{(N)}. \tag{3.10(N)}$$

To begin we consider $N = 0$. Since $\partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^0_{0,\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$, we have

$$b \in S^m_{(0)} \Rightarrow \partial_{\xi_k} b \in S^m_{0,\delta_0}(\check{\Gamma}) \Rightarrow\ \partial_{\xi_k} b\, \partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{0,\delta_0}(\check{\Gamma}). \tag{3.11}$$

It is easy to check that $\partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^{-\delta_0}_{\delta_0}(\hat{\Gamma} \cap \overline{\Gamma}_0)$ and consequently

$$b \in S^m_{(0)} \Rightarrow \partial_{\xi_k} b \in S^{m+\delta_0}_{\delta_0}(\hat{\Gamma}) \Rightarrow\ \partial_{\xi_k} b\, \partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{\delta_0}(\hat{\Gamma}). \tag{3.12}$$

However (3.11) and (3.12) imply $\partial_{\xi_k} b\, \partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{(0)}$, i.e. (3.10(0)) holds.

Reasoning by induction we assume that (3.10(N)) holds for a given $N \in \mathbb{N}$. If $b \in S^m_{(N+1)}$ is given by (3.5), then

$$b_\beta \in S^m_{(N)} \Rightarrow \partial_{\xi_k}\partial^\beta\hat{p}\, b_\beta \in S^m_{(N)} \Rightarrow \partial_{\xi_k}\partial^\beta\hat{p}\, b_\beta\, h^{-1/2}\partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{(N+1)}. \tag{3.13}$$

Moreover the induction hypothesis ensures

$$b_\beta \in S^m_{(N)} \Rightarrow \partial_{\xi_k} b_\beta\, \partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{(N)} \Rightarrow \partial_{\xi_k} b_\beta\, \partial^\alpha\hat{p}\, h^{-1/2}\partial^\beta\hat{p} \in S^m_{(N+1)}. \tag{3.14}$$

Summing up (3.13) and (3.14) we obtain $\partial_{\xi_k}(b_\beta\, h^{-1/2}\partial^\beta\hat{p})\partial^\alpha\hat{p} \in S^m_{(N+1)}$, which completes the proof of (3.10($N+1$)).

If $b \in S^m_{(N+1)}$ is given by (3.5) with $b_\beta \in S^m_{(N)}$, then $\partial_{\xi_k} b_\beta\, \partial^\beta\hat{p} \in S^m_{(N)}$ is ensured by (3.10(N)) and we obtain the assertion of Lemma 3.1(b) writing (3.9) with ∂_{ξ_k} instead of ∂^α. $\triangle$

3.3 Construction of the approximation

We define auxiliary classes of symbols $\check{S}^m_{(N)} \subset S^m_{(N)}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ as follows: we write $b \in \check{S}^m_{(N)}$ if and only if it is possible to find $b_j \in S^m_{(N-1)}$, $j \in \{0, 1, ..., d\}$, such that $b = b_0 + \sum_{1 \le j \le d} h^{-1/2} b_j \partial_{\xi_j}\hat{p}$.

Lemma 3.2 *Let b be independent of t. If $b \in S^m_{(N)}$ then*

$$(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar N} b)(t) = \sum_{0 \le n \le \bar N} t^n b_n \tag{3.15}$$

holds with $b_0 \in S^m_{(N)} \subset \check{S}^m_{(N+1)}$ and $b_n \in \check{S}^m_{(N+n+1)}$ for $n \in \{1, ..., \bar N\}$.

Proof. To begin we show that $b_0 \in S^m_{(N)}$. We observe that

$$b_0 = ih^{-1}(\hat p - \overline{p})b + \sum_{1 \le |\alpha| \le \bar N} \frac{h^{|\alpha|-1}}{\alpha!\, i^{|\alpha|-1}} \partial^\alpha_\xi (b\, \overline{\partial^\alpha_x p}\ ) \tag{3.16}$$

and since $p_h(x, hD)$ is self-adjoint, using (2.5) we obtain

$$|\alpha| \le 1 \Rightarrow \partial^\alpha (\hat p - \overline{p}) = 2i \text{ Im } \partial^\alpha p \in S^{-1}_{0,\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0). \tag{3.17}$$

We observe that the first term of the expresion (3.16) belongs to $S^m_{(N)}$ due to (3.17) with $\alpha = 0$. Then $b \in S^m_{(N)} \Rightarrow b\partial_{x_j}\hat p \in S^{m-1/2}_{(N+1)}$ and using (3.17) with $|\alpha| = 1$ we obtain $b\overline{\partial_{x_j} p} \in S^{m-1/2}_{(N+1)}$. Therefore Lemma 3.1(b) ensures $\partial_{\xi_j}(b\overline{\partial_{x_j} p}) \in S^m_{(N)}$, i.e. all terms of (3.16) with $|\alpha| = 1$ belong $S^m_{(N)}$.
In the next step we consider the terms of (3.16) with $|\alpha| \ge 2$.
Since (2.5) ensures $|\alpha| \ge 2 \Rightarrow \partial^\alpha_x p \in S^{(|\alpha|-2)\delta_0}_{0,\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$, we obtain

$$b\, \overline{\partial^\alpha_x p} \in S^{m+(|\alpha|-2)\delta_0}_{(N)} \Rightarrow h^{|\alpha|-1}\partial^\alpha_\xi (b\, \overline{\partial^\alpha_x p}) \in S^{-|\alpha|+1+|\alpha|/2+m+(|\alpha|-2)\delta_0}_{(N)}$$

due to Lemma 3.1(a) and $m + (|\alpha| - 2)(\delta_0 - \frac{1}{2}) \le m$ gives $b_0 \in S^m_{(N)}$.
In order to show $b_n \in \check{S}^m_{(N+n+1)}$ for $n \in \{2, ..., \bar N\}$ we write

$$b_n = \sum_{\substack{|\beta| \le n \le |\alpha| \le \bar N \\ \beta + \bar\beta \le \alpha}} h^{|\alpha|-1-n}\, b_{\beta,\bar\beta}\, (\nabla_\xi \hat p)^\beta\, \partial^{\bar\beta}_\xi (b\, \overline{\partial^\alpha_x p}\ ),$$

where $b_{\beta,\bar\beta} \in S^0_{0,\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$ for $\beta, \bar\beta \in \mathbb{N}^d$. More precisely: in the case $|\beta| < n$, $b_{\beta,\bar\beta}$ is a linear combination of terms $\Pi_{1 \le k \le n-|\beta|} \partial^{\bar\alpha(k)}_\xi \hat p$ where $\bar\alpha(k) \in \mathbb{N}^d$ are such that $|\bar\alpha(k)| \ge 2$ for $k \in \{1, ..., n - |\beta|\}$ and $\beta + \bar\beta + \sum_{1 \le k \le n-|\beta|} \bar\alpha(k) = \alpha$, implying

$$|\alpha| \ge |\beta| + |\bar\beta| + 2(n - |\beta|) = 2n + |\bar\beta| - |\beta|. \tag{3.18}$$

In the case $|\beta| = n$ the symbols $b_{\beta,\bar{\beta}}$ are constant and (3.18) still holds. Consider first the case $|\alpha| \geq 2$. Then using Lemma 3.1(a) we find

$$h^{|\alpha|-1-n} \partial_\xi^{\bar{\beta}} (b\, \overline{\partial_x^\alpha p}\ ) (\nabla_\xi \hat{p})^\beta \in S_{(N+|\beta|)}^{-|\alpha|+1+n+|\bar{\beta}|/2+m+(|\alpha|-2)\delta_0-|\beta|/2} \tag{3.19}$$

and (3.18) ensures

$$1 - 2\delta_0 + (2n + |\bar{\beta}| - |\beta|)/2 + |\alpha|(\delta_0 - 1) \leq (|\alpha| - 2)(\delta_0 - 1/2) \leq 0, \tag{3.20}$$

i.e. all terms corresponding to $|\alpha| \geq 2$ belong to $S_{(N+n)}^m \subset \check{S}_{(N+n+1)}^m$.
To complete the proof we observe that in the case $n = |\alpha| = 1$ we have

$$b\, \overline{\partial_{x_j} p} \in S_{(N+1)}^{m-1/2} \Rightarrow h^{-1} b\, \overline{\partial_{x_j} p}\, \partial_{\xi_j} \hat{p} \in \check{S}_{(N+2)}^m. \qquad \triangle$$

Proposition 3.3 *Let* $\check{l} \in S_{(0)}^0$ *and* $\bar{N} \in \mathbb{N}$. *Assume that* $N \in \{0, 1, ..., \bar{N}\}$. *Then we can find*

$$q_{\bar{N},N}(t) = \sum_{0 \leq n \leq N} t^n q_{\bar{N},n}^\circ \tag{3.21(N)}$$

such that $q_{\bar{N},0}^\circ = \check{l}$, $\ q_{\bar{N},1}^\circ \in S_{(0)}^0$,

$$q_{\bar{N},n}^\circ \in \check{S}_{(n)}^0 \quad \textit{for } \ n \in \{2, ..., N\} \tag{3.22(N)}$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}} q_{\bar{N},N}(t) = \sum_{N \leq n \leq N+\bar{N}} t^n \tilde{q}_{\bar{N},N,n}^\circ \tag{3.23(N)}$$

holds with

$$\tilde{q}_{\bar{N},N,n}^\circ \in \check{S}_{(n+1)}^0 \quad \textit{for } \ n \in \{N, ..., N + \bar{N}\}. \tag{3.24(N)}$$

Proof. If $N = 0$ then we take $q_{\bar{N},0}^\circ = \check{l} \in S_{(0)}^0$ and Lemma 3.2 with $b = \check{l}$ ensures (3.23(0)) and (3.24(0)). Next we assume that the statement of Proposition 3.3 holds for a given $N \leq \bar{N} - 1$ and using the induction hypothesis (3.23(N)) to express $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}} q_{\bar{N},N}(t)$ we find

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}} q_{\bar{N},N+1}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}}(t^{N+1} q_{\bar{N},N+1}^\circ) + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}} q_{\bar{N},N}(t) =$$

$$t^N \Big((N+1) q_{\bar{N},N+1}^\circ + \tilde{q}_{\bar{N},N,N}^\circ \Big) + t^{N+1} \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}} q_{\bar{N},N+1}^\circ(t) + \sum_{N+1 \leq n \leq N+\bar{N}} t^n\, \tilde{q}_{\bar{N},N,n}^\circ.$$

To obtain (3.23($N+1$)) we cancel the term with t^N taking

$$q^\circ_{\bar N,N+1} = -\tilde q^\circ_{\bar N,N,N}/(N+1),$$

which is an element of $\check S^0_{(N+1)}$ by the induction hypothesis (3.24(N)) and (3.24($N+1$)) follows if we develop $t^{N+1}\tilde{\mathcal P}_{\bar N} q^\circ_{\bar N,N+1}(t)$ as in Lemma 3.2 with $b = q^\circ_{\bar N,N+1} \in S^0_{(N+1)}$. Moreover for $N=0$ we have $q^\circ_{\bar N,1} = -\tilde q^\circ_{\bar N,0,0} \in S^0_{(0)}$ (due to Lemma 3.2 with $b=\check l$). △

4 Quality of the approximation

This section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 2.3. To begin we introduce more notations. We write $q \in \tilde S^m_{(0)}$ if and only if $q = (q_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]}$ with $q_h \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^{3d})$ satisfying the estimates

$$|\partial^\alpha q_h(x,\xi,y)| \le C_\alpha h^{-m-|\alpha|\delta_0} \tag{4.1}$$

for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{3d}$ and $\operatorname{supp} q_h \subset \overline{\Gamma}_0 \times \mathbb{R}^d$. As before $\hat p_h = \operatorname{Re} p_h$ and writing

$$(\mathrm{Op}^h_t[q]\varphi)(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dyd\xi}{(2\pi h)^d}\, \mathrm{e}^{i(x-y)\xi/h + it\hat p_h(x,\xi)/h} q_h(x,\xi,y)\varphi(y) \tag{4.2}$$

for $\varphi \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we define operators on $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$q \in \tilde S^m_{(0)} \;\Rightarrow\; \sup_{-t_0\le t\le t_0} ||\mathrm{Op}^h_t[q]||_{\mathrm{tr}} \le Ch^{-m-5d}. \tag{4.3}$$

Indeed, (4.3) follows from standard estimates of pseudo-differential operators (e.g. [14, Sec. 18]), the details are given in the proof of (4.4) in [24].
We observe that

$$\mathrm{tr}\ \mathrm{Op}^h_t[q] \;= \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dxd\xi}{(2\pi h)^d}\, \mathrm{e}^{it\hat p_h(x,\xi)/h} q_h(x,\xi,x) \tag{4.4}$$

and for $b_h \in C^\infty_0(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ we introduce the notation

$$J^h_t(b) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dxd\xi}{(2\pi h)^d}\, \mathrm{e}^{it\hat p_h(x,\xi)/h} b_h(x,\xi). \tag{4.5}$$

Using this notation and $Q^h_{\bar N}(t)\tilde L^*_h = \sum_{0\le k\le \bar N} t^k \mathrm{Op}^h_t[q^{\circ}_{\bar N,k}(x,\xi)\overline{\tilde l(y,\xi)}]$ with $\tilde l = 1$ on supp $q^{\circ}_{\bar N,k}$, we find the expression

$$\mathrm{tr}\, Q^h_{\bar N}(t)\tilde L^*_h = \sum_{0\le k\le \bar N} t^k J^h_t(q^{\circ}_{\bar N,k}). \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 4.1 *Let* $n\in\mathbb{N}$*.* (a) *If* $b\in S^m_{(N)}$ *then*

$$t^n J^h_t(b) = \sum_{0\le k\le n} t^k J^h_t(b_{k,n}) \tag{4.7(n)}$$

holds with some $b_{k,n}\in S^m_{(\max\{0,N-n\})}$ *for* $k\in\{0,\dots,n\}$*.*
(b) *If* $b\in \check S^m_{(N+1)}$*,* $N\ge 1$*, then* (4.7(n)) *holds with* $b_{k,n}\in S^m_{(\max\{0,N-n\})}$*.*

Proof. (a) Reasoning by induction we assume that the statement holds for a given $N\in\mathbb{N}$. In order to show that the statement still holds for $N+1$ instead of N we consider $b\in S^m_{(N+1)}$. Then (3.5) holds with $b_\beta\in S^m_{(N)}$ and $t^n J^h_t(b_0)$ can be expressed in a suitable way due to the induction hypothesis. Then the integration by parts gives

$$tJ^h_t(h^{-1/2}\partial^\beta\hat p\, b_\beta) = J^h_t(\tilde b_\beta) \text{ with } \tilde b_\beta = h^{1/2} i\partial^\beta b_\beta \tag{4.8}$$

and Lemma 3.1(a) ensures $\tilde b_\beta\in S^m_{(N)}$, i.e. (4.8) implies (4.7(1)). Reasoning by induction with respect to $n\in\mathbb{N}$ we obtain (4.7(n)).
(b) If $b\in\check S^m_{(N+1)}$, $\partial^\beta=\partial_{\xi_k}$, then $b_\beta\in S^m_{(N)}\Rightarrow \tilde b_\beta = h^{1/2}i\partial^\beta b_\beta\in S^m_{(N-1)}$ due to Lemma 3.1(b). Thus (4.8) gives $t^nJ^h_t(b) = t^nJ^h_t(b_0)+t^{n-1}J^h_t(\tilde b)$ with $b_0\in S^m_{(N)}$, $\tilde b\in S^m_{(N-1)}$ and we complete the proof using the assertion a) with b_0, $\tilde b$ instead of b. △

Proof of (2.19). Writing the terms $t^{k-1}J^h_t(q^{\circ}_{\bar N,k})$ with $k\in\{2,...,\bar N\}$ as described in Lemma 4.1(b) (for $N=n=k-1$ and $b=q^{\circ}_{\bar N,k}\in\check S^0_{(k)}$), we can express (4.6) in the form

$$\mathrm{tr}\, Q^h_{\bar N}(t)\tilde L^*_h = J^h_t(\check l_h) + \sum_{1\le k\le\bar N} t^k J^h_t(b_{\bar N,k}) \tag{4.9}$$

with some $b_{\bar N,k}\in S^0_{(0)}$. Changing the order of integrals we find

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{2\pi h} f^Z_h(t) J^h_t(\check l_h) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dv}{(2\pi h)^d}\check l_h(v)\ \tilde f^Z_h(\hat p_h(v)).$$

It remains to consider the terms of (4.9) with $k \in \{1, ..., \bar{N}\}$ and to estimate

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{2\pi h}\, f_h^Z(t) t^k J_t^h(b_{\bar{N},k}) \; = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dv}{(2\pi h)^d}\, b_{\bar{N},k,h}(v) i^{-k} h^k (\tilde{f}_h^Z)^{(k)}(\hat{p}_h(v)). \quad (4.10)$$

However $k \geq 1 \Rightarrow h^k(\tilde{f}_h^Z)^{(k)}(\lambda) = \tilde{\gamma}_1^{(k-1)}\!\left(\frac{\lambda - E_1}{h}\right) - \tilde{\gamma}_1^{(k-1)}\!\left(\frac{\lambda - E_2}{h}\right)$ and we have $|\tilde{\gamma}_1^{(k-1)}(\lambda)| \leq C_{k,N}(1+|\lambda|)^{-N}$ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, hence (4.10) can be estimated by

$$\sum_{1 \leq j \leq 2} h^{-d} \int_{\overline{\Gamma}_0} dv\, C'_{k,N} \left(1 + \frac{|\hat{p}_h(v) - E_j|}{Ch}\right)^{-N},$$

where we can choose $C \geq 1$ such that $\sup_{v \in \overline{\Gamma}_0} |a_0(v) - \hat{p}_h(v)| \; \leq \frac{1}{2} Ch$.
It is clear that the region $\{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : |\hat{p}_h(v) - E_j| \geq \frac{1}{3} h^{1-\varepsilon}\}$ gives a contribution $O(h^{N\varepsilon - d})$ and it remains to consider the regions

$$\Gamma_{E_j}^{h,n} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : C(n - 1/2)h \leq \hat{p}_h(v) - E_j \leq C(n + 1/2)h\}, \qquad (4.11)$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is such that $|n| < h^{-\varepsilon}/(2C)$. However

$$\Gamma_{E_j}^{h,n} \subset \widetilde{\Gamma}_{E_j}^{h,n} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : C(n-1)h \leq a_0(v) - E_j \leq C(n+1)h\}$$

and to complete the proof we observe that

$$\sum_{|n| < h^{-\varepsilon}/(2C)} \int_{\Gamma_{E_j}^{h,n}} dv \left(1 + \frac{|\hat{p}_h(v) - E_j|}{Ch}\right)^{-N} \leq \left(3 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2}{n^N}\right) \sup_{|n| < h^{-\varepsilon}/(2C)} \operatorname{vol} \widetilde{\Gamma}_{E_j}^{h,n}$$

can be estimated by $C_\varepsilon \mathcal{R}_{E_j}^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h)$. △

Our proof of (2.18) will use

Proposition 4.2 *Let* $\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2} < \mu < 1$ *and* $0 < \kappa \leq \min\{\mu - \delta_0 - \frac{1}{2},\ \frac{1-\mu}{2}\}$. *Then*

$$\sup_{\{t \in \mathbb{R}:\ |t| \leq h^{1-\mu}\}} |\operatorname{tr}\,(Q_{\bar{N}}^h(t) - \check{L}_h \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h})\tilde{L}_h^* \,| \;\leq C_{\bar{N}} h^{\bar{N}\kappa - 5d - 1}. \qquad (4.12)$$

To begin we describe the form of $\tilde{Q}^h_{\bar{N}}(t)$. Since $P = P^* = p(x, hD)^*$, we have

$$Q^h_{\bar{N}}(t)P_h = \mathrm{Op}^h_t[q_{\bar{N},\bar{N}}(t,x,\xi)\overline{p(y,\xi)}]$$

and the standard Taylor's development of $\overline{p(\cdot,\xi)}$ in x, followed by integrations by parts based on $(x-y)^\alpha \mathrm{e}^{i(x-y)\xi/h} = (-ih)^{|\alpha|}\partial^\alpha_\xi(\mathrm{e}^{i(x-y)\xi/h})$, gives

$$\tilde{Q}^h_{\bar{N}}(t) = \mathrm{Op}^h_t[(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\bar{N}} q_{\bar{N},\bar{N}})(t,x,\xi) + r_{\bar{N}}(t,x,\xi,y)] \tag{4.13}$$

with

$$r_{\bar{N},h}(t,x,\xi,y) = h^{-1}\mathrm{e}^{-it\hat{p}_h(x,\xi)/h}(\bar{N}+1)\int_0^1 d\sigma\ (1-\sigma)^{\bar{N}}\tilde{r}_{\bar{N},\sigma,h}(t,x,\xi,y),$$

$$\tilde{r}_{\bar{N},\sigma,h}(t,x,\xi,y) =$$

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=\bar{N}+1}\frac{(-ih)^{|\alpha|}}{\alpha!}\partial^\alpha_\xi\Big((q_{\bar{N},\bar{N},h}(t)\mathrm{e}^{it\hat{p}_h/h})(x,\xi)\,\overline{\partial^\alpha_x p_h(x+\sigma(y-x),\xi)}\Big). \tag{4.14}$$

We describe the properties of $r_{\bar{N}}(t)$ introducing new classes of symbols. We define $\tilde{S}^m_{\mu,(N)}$ for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ setting $\tilde{S}^m_{\mu,\,(0)} = \tilde{S}^m_{(0)}$ and writing $b \in \tilde{S}^m_{\mu,(N+1)}$ if and only if

$$b_h(x,\xi,y) = b_{0,h}(x,\xi,y) + \sum_{|\beta|=1} b_{\beta,h}(x,\xi,y)h^{-\mu/2}\partial^\beta\hat{p}_h(x,\xi) \tag{4.15}$$

holds with some $b_\beta \in \tilde{S}^m_{\mu,\,(N)}$ for $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$ satisfying $|\beta| \leq 1$. Then

$$\tilde{S}^m_{1,\,(N)} \subset \tilde{S}^{m+(1-\mu)N/2}_{\mu,\,(N)} \tag{4.16}$$

and we adopt the following convention: every $(b_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]} \in S^m_{(N)}$ is identified with $(x,\xi,y) \to b_h(x,\xi)$ defining an element of $\tilde{S}^m_{1,\,(N)}$.

To deduce (4.12) using (3.3) we consider $t = h^{1-\mu}\tilde{t}$, $\tau = h^{1-\mu}\tilde{\tau}$ and $\mathcal{V} = \{(\tilde{t},\tilde{\tau}) \in ([-t_0;\ t_0]\setminus\{0\})^2 :\ 0 \leq \tilde{\tau}/\tilde{t} \leq 1\}$. We denote $U^h_s = \mathrm{e}^{isP/h^\mu}$ and we observe that (4.12) follows from

$$\sup_{(\tilde{t},\tilde{\tau})\in\mathcal{V}}\left|\mathrm{tr}\left(\tilde{Q}^h_{\bar{N}}(t)U^h_{\tilde{\tau}}\tilde{L}^*_h\right)_{t=h^{1-\mu}(\tilde{t}-\tilde{\tau})}\right| \ \leq\ C_{\bar{N}}h^{\bar{N}\kappa-5d-1}. \tag{4.17}$$

However using the form of $q_{\bar N,\bar N}(t)$ in (4.14) we obtain the expressions of the form considered in the proof of Lemma 3.2 and applying (3.19), (3.20) with $|\alpha| = \bar N + 1$ we find $r_{\bar N}(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{2\bar N} t^n r^\circ_{\bar N,n}$ with

$$r^\circ_{\bar N,n} \in \tilde S^{-(\bar N+1)(1/2-\delta_0)}_{1,(2\bar N+1)} \subset \tilde S^{-(\bar N+1)(\mu-1/2-\delta_0)}_{\mu,\,(2\bar N+1)} \tag{4.18}$$

[the inclusion follows from (4.16)]. Due to (3.23($\bar N$)) we have

$$t = h^{1-\mu}\tilde t \implies (\tilde{\mathcal P}_{\bar N} q_{\bar N,\bar N})(t) = \sum_{\bar N \le n \le 2\bar N} \tilde t^{\,n}\, \tilde q^{(\mu)}_{\bar N,\bar N,n} \tag{4.19}$$

with $\tilde q^{(\mu)}_{\bar N,\bar N,n,h} = h^{n(1-\mu)} \tilde q^\circ_{\bar N,\bar N,n,h}$ belonging to $\tilde S^{-n(1-\mu)}_{1,(n+1)} \subset \tilde S^{-n(1-\mu)/2}_{\mu,\,(n+1)}$. Combining (4.18) and (4.19) we find the expression

$$t = h^{1-\mu}\tilde t \implies \tilde Q^h_{\bar N}(t) = \sum_{0 \le n \le 2\bar N} \tilde t^{\,n}\, \mathrm{Op}^h_t[\,(1 - \tilde\tau/\tilde t\,)^n\, b^{(\mu)}_{\bar N,n}\,], \tag{4.20}$$

with $b^{(\mu)}_{\bar N,n} \in \tilde S^{-\bar N\kappa}_{\mu,\,(n+1)}$ similarly as in the formula (4.14) of [26] and following [26] we denote

$$J^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau}(b, Y) = \mathrm{tr}\left(\mathrm{Op}^h_t[b] U^h_{\tilde\tau} Y^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau}\right)_{t = h^{1-\mu}(\tilde t - \tilde\tau)} \tag{4.21}$$

if $b \in \tilde S^m_{\mu,(N)}$ and $Y = (Y^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau})_{(h,\tilde t,\tilde\tau)\in]0;\,h_0]\times\mathcal V} \subset B(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$. Due to (4.20) the estimate (4.17) follows from

$$\sup_{(\tilde t,\tilde\tau)\in\mathcal V} |\,\tilde t^{\,n} J^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau}(b^{(\mu)}_{\bar N,n}, \tilde L^*)| \;\le\; C_{\bar N} h^{\bar N\kappa - 5d - 1}. \tag{4.22}$$

Next we observe that the properties of operators P_h given in Lemma 2.1 allow us to follow the reasoning of Sections 5-6 in [26]. More precisely: let $T_j = h^{\mu/2-1} x_j$, $T_{-j} = h^{\mu/2}\partial_{x_j}$, $P_{\pm j} = [ih^{-\mu}P,\, T_{\pm j}]$ for $j \in \{1, ..., d\}$ and write $B \in \Psi^m_{\delta_0}$ if and only if $B = (b_h(x, hD))_{h\in]0;\,h_0]}$ holds with $(b_h)_{h\in]0;\,h_0]} \in S^m_{\delta_0}$. Using $\mu > \delta_0 + \frac{1}{2} > 2\delta_0$ it is easy to check that for every $B \in \Psi^0_{\delta_0}$ we have $[B, T_{\pm j}] \in \Psi^0_{\delta_0}$ and $[B, P_{\pm j}] \in \Psi^{-\kappa}_{\delta_0}$ with $\kappa > 0$. Thus it is easy to check that using $T_{\pm j}$, $P_{\pm j}$ as above and $\Psi^0_{\delta_0}$ instead of Ψ^0 in the definition of $\mathcal Y$, we can follow the reasoning of the proof of Proposition 4.2 of [26] and we obtain

Proposition 4.3 *Let $K = K(\bar N, n) \in \mathbb{N}$ be large enough. Then one can write*

$$\tilde t^{\,n}\, J^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau}(b^{(\mu)}_{\bar N,n}, \tilde L^*) = \sum_{1\le k\le K} J^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau}(b_{k,n}, Y_{k,n}) \ \ \textit{for} \ \ (\tilde t,\tilde\tau)\in\mathcal{V}, \tag{4.23}$$

where $b_{k,n} \in \tilde S^{-\bar N\kappa}_{(1)}$ (for $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$) and $Y_{k,n} = (Y^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau,n,k})_{(h,\tilde t,\tilde\tau)\in]0;\, h_0]\times\mathcal{V}}$ is a bounded subset of $B(L^2(\mathbb{R}^d))$ (for $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$).

Proof of Proposition 4.2. We observe that (4.22) follows from Proposition 4.3 similarly as in [26]. Indeed, using the expression (4.23) it suffices to write

$$|J^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau}(b_{k,n}, Y_{k,n})| \le ||\mathrm{Op}^h_t[b_{k,n}]_{t=h^{1-\mu}(\tilde t-\tilde\tau)}\,||_{\mathrm{tr}}\ ||Y^h_{\tilde t,\tilde\tau,n,k}|| \le Ch^{\bar N\kappa-5d-1/2},$$

where we used (4.3) with $q = b_{k,n} \in \tilde S^{-\bar N\kappa}_{(1)} \subset \tilde S^{1/2-\bar N\kappa}_{(0)}$. △

To complete the proof of Proposition 2.3 it remains to use

Proposition 4.4 *If $\mu > \delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}$ then*

$$\sup_{\{t\in\mathbb{R}:\ h^{1-\mu}\le|t|\le t_0\}} |\operatorname{tr}\check L_h\, \mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h}\tilde L^*_h\,| \ = \ O(h^\infty), \tag{4.24}$$

$$\sup_{\{t\in\mathbb{R}:\ h^{1-\mu}\le|t|\le t_0\}} |\operatorname{tr} Q^h_{\bar N}(t)\tilde L^*_h\,| \ = \ O(h^\infty). \tag{4.25}$$

5 Proof of Proposition 4.4

Proof of (4.25). Let κ be as in Proposition 4.2 and

$$b = (b_h)_{h\in]0;\, h_0]} \in S^m_{\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}) \ \text{ with } \ \mathrm{supp}\, b_h \subset \check\Gamma(\bar c h^{\delta_0}) \cap \overline{\Gamma}_0. \tag{5.1}$$

We will show that

$$\sup_{\{t\in\mathbb{R}:\ h^{1-\mu}\le|t|\le t_0\}} |J^h_t(b)| \ = \ O(h^{n\kappa-m}) \tag{5.2(n)}$$

holds for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, which ensures (4.25) due to (4.6).
Reasoning by induction we assume that the assertion holds for a given $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Using the cut-off functions from the proof of Lemma 2.4, it is easy to see

that the assumptions (5.1) ensure the existence of $b_\beta \in S^m_{\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ such that $b = \sum_{|\beta|=1} b_\beta h^{-\delta_0}\partial^\beta \hat{p}$ and supp $b_\beta \subset$ supp b. The integration by parts gives

$$J^h_t(b) = \sum_{|\beta|=1} t^{-1} J^h_t(h^{1-\delta_0} i\partial^\beta b_\beta). \tag{5.3}$$

The induction hypothesis applied to $h^{1-\delta_0}\partial^\beta b_\beta \in S^{m+2\delta_0-1}_{\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ ensures

$$h^{1-\mu} \le |t| \le t_0 \;\Rightarrow |t^{-1}J^h_t(h^{1-\delta_0}\partial^\beta b_\beta)| \le Ch^{-(1-\mu)+n\kappa-m-2\delta_0+1}. \tag{5.4}$$

Since $\mu - 2\delta_0 > \mu - \delta_0 - \frac{1}{2} \ge \kappa$, it is clear that (5.3–4) imply (5.2($n+1$)). $\triangle$

Let $\hat{\vartheta}^h_t \colon \mathbb{R}^{2d} \to \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be the Hamiltonian flow of $\hat{p}_h$, i.e. $t \to \hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v)$ satisfies

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) = \mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v)), \qquad \hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v)|_{t=0} = v,$$

where $\mathcal{J} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{\mathbb{R}^d} & I_{\mathbb{R}^d} \\ -I_{\mathbb{R}^d} & 0_{\mathbb{R}^d} \end{pmatrix}$.

Lemma 5.1 *Assume that $t_0 > 0$ is small enough. Then*

$$-t_0 \le t \le t_0 \Rightarrow |\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v| \ge |t\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)|/2. \tag{5.5}$$

Proof. Set $M^h_t(v) = \int_0^1 ds\, \mathcal{J}\nabla d\hat{p}_h(v + s(\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v))$. Then

$$\mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v)) - \mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v) = M^h_t(v)(\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v) \tag{5.6}$$

and $\frac{d}{dt}(\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v) = M^h_t(v)(\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v) + \mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)$. Therefore introducing the solution of the linear homogeneous system

$$\tfrac{d}{dt}R^h_{t,\tau}(v) = M^h_t(v)R^h_{t,\tau}(v) \qquad R^h_{t,\tau}(v)|_{t=\tau} = I$$

we obtain $\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v = \int_0^t d\tau R^h_{t,\tau}(v)\mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)$, which ensures

$$-1 \le t \le 1 \Rightarrow |\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v| \le C_1|t\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)|. \tag{5.7}$$

Using $\int_0^t d\tau\ \frac{d}{d\tau}(\hat{\vartheta}^h_\tau(v) - v - \tau\mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)) = \int_0^t d\tau\ \mathcal{J}(\nabla\hat{p}_h(\hat{\vartheta}^h_\tau(v)) - \nabla\hat{p}_h(v))$ and (5.6) we obtain

$$|\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v - t\mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)| \le \int_0^t d\tau\, |M^h_\tau(v)||\hat{\vartheta}^h_\tau(v) - v|. \tag{5.8}$$

Using (5.7) to estimate the right hand side of (5.8) we obtain

$$-1 \le t \le 1 \Rightarrow |\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v - t\mathcal{J}\nabla \hat{p}_h(v)| \le C_2 t^2 |\mathcal{J}\nabla \hat{p}_h(v)|. \tag{5.9}$$

Writing $|\hat{\vartheta}^h_\tau(v) - v| \ge |t\mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)| - |\hat{\vartheta}^h_t(v) - v - t\mathcal{J}\nabla\hat{p}_h(v)|$ and using (5.9) we obtain (5.5) if $|t| \le \min\{1,\ 1/(2C_2)\}$. △

For $h \in]0;\ h_0]$ let Ω_h be a set of parameters. We say that the family $(b_{\omega,h})_{(\omega,h)\in\Omega_h\times]0;\,h_0]}$ is bounded in $S^m_\delta(\Gamma)$ if and only if the estimates

$$\sup_{\omega\in\Omega_h}\sup_{v\in\Gamma_h} |\partial^\alpha b_{\omega,h}(v)| \le C_\alpha h^{-m-|\alpha|\delta} \tag{5.10}$$

hold for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$.

Lemma 5.2 *Assume that* $l, \tilde{l} \in S^0_\delta(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ *satisfy*

$$\mathrm{dist}(\,\mathrm{supp}\,\tilde{l}_h, \mathrm{supp}\,(1-l_h)\,) \ \ge h^\delta. \tag{5.11}$$

Let $\tilde{L}_h = \tilde{l}_h(x, hD)$ *and* $L_h(t) = (l_h \circ \hat{\vartheta}^h_t)(x, hD)$. *Then*

$$||(I - L_h(t))\mathrm{e}^{itP_h/h}\tilde{L}_h|| \ = \ O(h^\infty). \tag{5.12}$$

Proof. We observe that for $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^{2d}$ such that $|\alpha| \le 1$, the matrix elements of $(\partial^\alpha \hat{\vartheta}^h_t)_{(t,h)\in[-t_0;\,t_0]\times]0;\,h_0]}$ are bounded families in $S^0_{\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$ and it is easy to check that for every $l \in S^m_{\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$, the family $(l_h \circ \hat{\vartheta}^h_t)_{(t,h)\in[-t_0;\,t_0]\times]0;\,h_0]}$ is bounded in $S^m_{\delta_0}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$. Then the properties of operators P_h given in Lemma 2.1 allow us to follow the proof of Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 of [24] with $|t| \le t_0$ instead of $|t| \le 2h^{\delta_0}$. △

Proof of (4.24). We can consider a family of balls $\{B(\bar{v}_{n,h}, h^\delta)\}_{n\in\{1,\dots,N(h)\}}$ covering $\mathrm{supp}\,\check{l} \subset \check{\Gamma}(\bar{c}h^{\delta_0}) \cap \overline{\Gamma}_0$ with $\bar{v}_{n,h} \in \check{\Gamma}(\bar{c}h^{\delta_0}) \cap \overline{\Gamma}_0$ for $n \in \{1, ..., N(h)\}$ and $N(h) \le Ch^{-2d\delta}$. Using a suitable partition of unity we decompose

$$\check{l}_h = \sum_{1\le n\le N(h)} \check{l}_{n,h} \quad \text{with}\ \mathrm{supp}\,\check{l}_{n,h} \subset B(\bar{v}_{n,h}, h^\delta),$$

where $(\check{l}_{n,h})_{(n,h)\in\{1,\dots,N(h)\}\times]0;\,h_0]}$ is bounded in $S^0_\delta(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$.

Let $(\tilde{l}_{n,h})_{(n,h)\in\{1,\dots,N(h)\}\times]0;\,h_0]}$, $(l_{n,h})_{(n,h)\in\{1,\dots,N(h)\}\times]0;\,h_0]}$ be bounded in $S^0_\delta(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and such that $\operatorname{supp}\tilde{l}_{n,h}\subset B(\bar{v}_{n,h},2h^\delta)$, $\quad\operatorname{supp} l_{n,h}\subset B(\bar{v}_{n,h},4h^\delta)$. Using the trace cyclicity and assuming $\tilde{l}_{n,h}=1$ on $B(\bar{v}_{n,h},h^\delta)$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{tr}\check{L}_h e^{itP_h/h}\tilde{L}^*_h &= \sum_{1\le n\le N(h)}\operatorname{tr} e^{itP_h/h}\tilde{L}^*_h\check{L}_{n,h}\\ &= \sum_{1\le n\le N(h)}\operatorname{tr} e^{itP_h/h}\tilde{L}_{n,h}\tilde{L}^*_h\check{L}_{n,h}+O(h^\infty),\end{aligned}\tag{5.13}$$

where we have denoted $\check{L}_{n,h}=\check{l}_{n,h}(x,hD)$ and $\tilde{L}_{n,h}=\tilde{l}_{n,h}(x,hD)$.
We assume $l_{n,h}=1$ on $B(\bar{v}_{n,h},3h^\delta)$ and introduce $L_{n,h}(t)=(l_{n,h}\circ\hat{\vartheta}^h_t)(x,hD)$. Since the assertion of Lemma 5.2 still holds with $l_{n,h}$ and $\tilde{l}_{n,h}$ instead of l_h and $\tilde{l}_h$, (5.13) can be written as

$$\sum_{1\le n\le N(h)}\operatorname{tr} L_{n,h}(t)e^{itP_h/h}\tilde{L}_{n,h}\tilde{L}^*_h\check{L}_{n,h}+O(h^\infty).\tag{5.14}$$

To complete the proof it suffices to check that

$$h^{1-\mu}\le|t|\le t_0\Rightarrow\operatorname{supp}\check{l}_{n,h}\cap\operatorname{supp}\,(l_{n,h}\circ\hat{\vartheta}^h_t)\,=\emptyset\tag{5.15}$$

holds for a certain $\delta\in[0;\ 1/2[$. Indeed, (5.15) ensures $||\check{L}_{n,h}L_{n,h}(t)||=O(h^\infty)$ and (5.14) is $O(h^\infty)$ due to the trace cyclicity.

To obtain (5.15) we observe that

$$\begin{gathered}\operatorname{supp}\,(l_{n,h}\circ\hat{\vartheta}^h_t)\subset\hat{\vartheta}^h_{-t}(B(\bar{v}_{n,h},4h^\delta))\subset B(\hat{\vartheta}^h_{-t}(\bar{v}_{n,h}),C_0h^\delta)\Rightarrow\\ \operatorname{dist}(\,\operatorname{supp}\check{l}_{n,h},\operatorname{supp}\,(l_{n,h}\circ\hat{\vartheta}^h_t)\,)\ge|\hat{\vartheta}^h_{-t}(\bar{v}_{n,h})-\bar{v}_{n,h}|-(1+C_0)h^\delta.\end{gathered}\tag{5.16}$$

Since $\bar{v}_{n,h}\in\check{\Gamma}(\bar{c}h^{\delta_0})\cap\overline{\Gamma}_0\Rightarrow|\nabla\hat{p}_h(\bar{v}_{n,h})|\ge\bar{c}h^{\delta_0}/2$, Lemma 5.1 ensures

$$h^{1-\mu}\le|t|\le t_0\Rightarrow|\hat{\vartheta}^h_{-t}(\bar{v}_{n,h})-\bar{v}_{n,h}|\ge|t\nabla\hat{p}_h(\bar{v}_{n,h})|/2\ge\bar{c}h^{1-\mu+\delta_0}/4$$

and (5.16) implies (5.15) if we take $\delta\in]1-\mu+\delta_0;\ 1/2[$. $\triangle$

6 End of the proof of Theorem 1.2

Since $d^2 a_0$ is continuous, we can assume that $c > 0$ is small enough to ensure

$$v \in \mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}(c) \Rightarrow \operatorname{rank}(d^2 a_0(v)) \geq 2, \tag{6.1}$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}(c) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : |a_0(v) - E| + |\nabla a_0(v)| \leq 2c\}.$$

Until now we have proved

$$\left| \operatorname{tr} \tilde{f}_h^Z(P_h)\check{L}_h - \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \frac{dv}{(2\pi h)^d} \tilde{f}_h^Z(\hat{p}_h(v))\check{l}_h(v) \right| \leq C_\varepsilon \, h^{-d} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \mathcal{R}_{E_j}^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h) \tag{6.2}$$

and we can deduce Theorem 1.2 from Lemma 2.2 if we show

Proposition 6.1 *Let l be as in Lemma 2.2, $\hat{l}$ as in Lemma 2.4 and $\hat{L}_h = \hat{l}_h(x, hD)$. If (6.1) holds and*

$$\tfrac{1}{2}\left(1 - \tfrac{1}{4m_0 - 1}\right) < \delta_0 < \tfrac{1}{2}, \tag{6.3}$$

then

$$\operatorname{tr} \hat{L}_h \tilde{f}_h^Z(P_h) \;=\; o(h^{1-d}), \tag{6.4}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \hat{l}_h(\tilde{f}_h^Z \circ \hat{p}_h) \;=\; o(h). \tag{6.5}$$

The proof of Proposition 6.1 uses the following trace norm estimate

Lemma 6.2 *Let $\hat{L}_h = \hat{l}_h(x, hD)$ with $\hat{l} \in S^0_{\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$ and denote*

$$\Gamma_h = \operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h + B(0, h^{\delta_0}) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : \operatorname{dist}(v, \operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h) < h^{\delta_0}\}. \tag{6.6}$$

Then $||\hat{L}_h||_{\mathrm{tr}} \leq C h^{-d} \operatorname{vol} \Gamma_h$.

Proof. Let $B_h = b_h(x, hD)$ with $b \in S^0_{\delta_0}(\mathbb{R}^{2d})$. It is well known (cf. e.g. [21]) that the Hilbert-Schmidt norm

$$||B_h||_{\mathrm{HS}} = (2\pi)^{-d}\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} |b_h(v)|^2 h^{-d} dv\Big)^{1/2} \leq C h^{-d/2}(\operatorname{vol}[\operatorname{supp} b_h])^{1/2}.$$

We can assume $b_h = 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h$ and $\operatorname{supp} b_h \subset \Gamma_h$. Therefore we have $||\hat{L}_h(I - B_h)||_{\mathrm{tr}} = O(h^\infty)$ and we complete the proof writing

$$||\hat{L}_h B_h||_{\mathrm{tr}} \leq ||\hat{L}_h||_{\mathrm{HS}} ||B_h||_{\mathrm{HS}} \leq C h^{-d}\Big(\operatorname{vol}[\operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h] \cdot \operatorname{vol}[\operatorname{supp} b_h]\Big)^{1/2}. \quad \triangle$$

Instead of Proposition 6.1 it suffices to show

Proposition 6.3 *Let l be as in Lemma* 2.2 *and $\hat{l}$ as in Lemma* 2.4. *If Γ_h is given by* (6.6), *then*

$$\operatorname{vol}\Gamma_h \ = O(h^{\delta_0(4m_0-1)/(2m_0-1)}). \tag{6.7}$$

Indeed, since (6.3) ensures $\delta_0(4m_0-1)/(2m_0-1) > 1$, it is obvious that (6.7) implies (6.5) and using Lemma 6.2 we obtain similarly (6.4).

To begin the proof of Proposition 6.3 we introduce the following notation:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_j = \partial_{x_j} & \text{if } \ j \in J_+ = \{1, ..., d\} \\ \partial_j = \partial_{\xi_{-j}} & \text{if } \ j \in J_- = \{-1, ..., -d\} \end{cases}.$$

Let $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be such that $\operatorname{rank}(d^2a_0(\bar{v})) \geq 2$. Then there exist $j(1,\bar{v}), j(2,\bar{v}) \in J = J_+ \cup J_-$ such that $\nabla\partial_{j(k,\bar{v})}a_0(\bar{v}) \neq 0$ for $k \in \{1,2\}$ and the angle $\sphericalangle(\nabla\partial_{j(1,\bar{v})}a_0(\bar{v}), \nabla\partial_{j(2,\bar{v})}a_0(\bar{v})) \neq 0$. Therefore we can find two linearly independent vectors $e_{1,\bar{v}}, e_{2,\bar{v}} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ satisfying

$$e_{k,\bar{v}} \cdot \nabla\partial_{j(k,\bar{v})}a_0(\bar{v}) \ = \theta_{k,\bar{v}} > 0, \tag{6.8}$$

$$e_{k,\bar{v}} \notin \{(0,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : \ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \tag{6.9}$$

for $k \in \{1,2\}$. Since $d \geq 2$ we can find

$$e_{3,\bar{v}} \in \{(0,\xi) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} : \ \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \tag{6.10}$$

such that the system $(e_{k,\bar{v}})_{k\in\{1,2,3\}}$ is linearly independent.

Lemma 6.4 *Let $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$ be such that $\operatorname{rank}(d^2a_0(\bar{v})) \geq 2$ and let $\varepsilon_{\bar{v}} > 0$ be small enough. If $\hat{\Gamma}_h$ is given by* (2.20) *and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, then the Lebesgue measure of*

$$\{s \in \mathbb{R} : \ se_{k,\bar{v}} + v \in B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h \ \} \tag{6.11(k)}$$

can be estimated by $C_{\bar{v}}h^{\rho_k}$, where

$$\rho_1 = \rho_2 = \delta_0, \qquad \rho_3 = \delta_0/(2m_0-1) \tag{6.12}$$

and the constant $C_{\bar{v}}$ is independent of $(h,v) \in]0; \ h_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$.

Let us check that Proposition 6.3 follows from Lemma 6.4. To begin we observe that (2.10) gives

$$v \in \Gamma_h \subset \operatorname{supp} l_h + B(0, h^{\delta_0}) \Rightarrow |a_0(v) - E| \leq c + Ch^{\delta_0}$$

and using $\Gamma_h \subset \operatorname{supp} \hat{l}_h \subset \hat{\Gamma}_h$ we can choose $h_0 > 0$ small enough to ensure $\Gamma_h \subset \mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}(c)$ for $h \in]0;\ h_0]$. The family $\{B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}})\}_{\bar{v} \in \mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}(c)}$ contains a finite covering of $\mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}(c)$ and it suffices to show that for every $\bar{v} \in \mathcal{C}_E^{a_0}(c)$ one has

$$\operatorname{vol} B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h \leq \bar{C}_{\bar{v}} h^{\rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_3}. \tag{6.13}$$

The system $(e_{k,\bar{v}})_{k \in \{1,2,3\}}$ can be completed to a basis $(e_{k,\bar{v}})_{k \in \{1,\dots,2d\}}$ and let $(e_{k,\bar{v}}^*)_{k \in \{1,\dots,2d\}}$ denote the dual basis in $(\mathbb{R}^{2d})^*$. Let $(e_k)_{k \in \{1,\dots,2d\}}$ denote the canonical basis of $\mathbb{R}^{2d}$ and let $(e_k^*)_{k \in \{1,\dots,2d\}}$ be its dual. Then the set $(6.11(k))$ has the form

$$e_{k,\bar{v}}^*(B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h - v) = e_k^*(W_{\bar{v}}(B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h - v)),$$

where $W_{\bar{v}} \in \operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{R}^{2d}, \mathbb{R}^{2d})$ is the matrix of the corresponding change of variables. The assertion of Lemma 6.4 allows us to estimate the measure of

$$\{ s \in \mathbb{R} :\ se_k + v \in W_{\bar{v}}(B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h) \} \tag{6.14}$$

by $C_{\bar{v}} h^{\rho_k}$ for $(h, v) \in]0;\ h_0] \times \mathbb{R}^{2d}$, hence the Fubini's theorem gives

$$\operatorname{vol} W_{\bar{v}}(B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h) \leq C_{\bar{v}}^3 h^{\rho_1 + \rho_2 + \rho_3}. \tag{6.15}$$

However $\operatorname{vol} B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h = |\det W_{\bar{v}}|^{-1} \operatorname{vol} W_{\bar{v}}(B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \cap \hat{\Gamma}_h)$ and it is clear that (6.13) follows from (6.15).

Proof of Lemma 6.4. To begin we observe that the set (6.11(k)) is included in the interval

$$\Delta_{k,\bar{v},v} = \{ s \in \mathbb{R} :\ se_{k,\bar{v}} + v \in B(\bar{v}, \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}) \}. \tag{6.16}$$

For $k \in \{1, \dots, 2d\}$ let $u_{k,\bar{v},v} : \Delta_{k,\bar{v},v} \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined by the formula

$$u_{k,\bar{v},v}(s) = \partial_{j(k,\bar{v})} a_0(se_{k,\bar{v}} + v). \tag{6.17}$$

By the definition of $\hat{\Gamma}_h$ we find that the set $(6.11(k))$ is included in

$$\{ s \in \Delta_{k,\bar{v},v} :\ -\bar{C}h^{\delta_0} \leq u_{k,\bar{v},v}(s) \leq \bar{C}h^{\delta_0} \}. \tag{6.18(k)}$$

We claim that using (6.8) we can ensure

$$s \in \Delta_{k,\bar{v},v} \Rightarrow \tfrac{d}{ds} u_{k,\bar{v},v}(s) > \theta_{k,\bar{v}}/2, \tag{6.19}$$

for $k \in \{1,2\}$ if $\varepsilon_{\bar{v}} > 0$ is fixed small enough. It is clear that (6.19) implies the fact that (6.18(k)) defines an interval of length smaller than $2\bar{C}h^{\delta_0}/\theta_{k,\bar{v}}$. In order to prove (6.19) we observe that

$$\tfrac{d}{ds} u_{k,\bar{v},v}(s) = e_{k,\bar{v}} \cdot \nabla \partial_{j(k,\bar{v})} a_0(s e_{k,\bar{v}} + v),$$

hence $\frac{d}{ds} u_{k,\bar{v},\bar{v}}(0) = \theta_{k,\bar{v}} > 0$. Moreover

$$s \in \Delta_{k,\bar{v},v} \Rightarrow \left| \tfrac{d}{ds} u_{k,\bar{v},v}(s) - \tfrac{d}{ds} u_{k,\bar{v},\bar{v}}(0) \right| \leq C|s e_{k,\bar{v}} + v - \bar{v}|^{r_0} \leq C \varepsilon_{\bar{v}}^{r_0}$$

and (6.19) follows if $\varepsilon_{\bar{v}}$ is such that $C\varepsilon_{\bar{v}}^{r_0} < \theta_{k,\bar{v}}/2$.
To estimate the measure of (6.11(3)) we observe that (6.18(3)) holds if we take $u_{3,\bar{v},v}(s) = e_{3,\bar{v}} \cdot \nabla a_0(s e_{3,\bar{v}} + v)$, which is polynomial of degree $2m_0 - 1$ due to (6.10) and the ellipticity hypothesis (1.9) ensures $(\frac{d}{ds})^{2m_0-1} u_{3,\bar{v},v}(s) = (\frac{d}{ds})^{2m_0-1} u_{3,\bar{v},v}(0) \geq c_0 > 0$. Thus to complete the proof of Lemma 6.4 it suffices to show

Lemma 6.5 *Let $(F_\omega)_{\omega \in \Omega}$ be a family of polynomials of order $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and*

$$\Delta_\omega^h = \{ s \in \mathbb{R} : \, |F_\omega(s)| < (Ch)^{\delta_0} \}.$$

If the m-th derivative satisfies $|F_\omega^{(m)}(0)| \geq 1$, then the Lebesgue measure of Δ_ω^h can be estimated by $C_m h^{\delta_0/m}$, where C_m is independent of $\omega \in \Omega$.

Proof. We drop the index ω and for $k \in \{0, ..., m\}$ we set

$$\Delta_k^h = \{ s \in \mathbb{R} : \, |F^{(k)}(s)| < (Ch)^{\delta_k} \},$$

where $\delta_k = \delta_0(1 - k/m)$. We can write Δ_0^h as the union of

$$\Delta^h_{(j_1, j_2, ..., j_m)} = \Delta_0^h \cap \Delta_1^{h,j_1} \cap \Delta_2^{h,j_2} \cap \ldots \cap \Delta_m^{h,j_m},$$

where $j_k \in \{1, -1\}$, $\Delta_k^{h,1} = \Delta_k^h$ and $\Delta_k^{h,-1} = \mathbb{R} \setminus \Delta_k^h$.
Since $\delta_m = 0$, the assumption $|F^{(m)}(0)| \geq 1$ implies $\Delta_m^h = \emptyset$ and for every $(j_1, ..., j_m) \in \{1, -1\}^m$ we can find $k \in \{1, ..., m\}$ such that

$$\Delta^h_{(j_1, j_2, ..., j_m)} \subset \Delta_{k-1}^h \setminus \Delta_k^h$$

However $F^{(k)}$ is a polynomial of order $m-k$, Δ^h_k is a union of at most $m-k$ intervals and

$$\Delta^h_{k-1} \setminus \Delta^h_k \;=\; \bigcup_{1\le j\le j(k,h)} \Delta^h_{k,j}$$

where $j(k,h) \le 2(m-k)$ and $\Delta^h_{k,j}$ are intervals such that

$$s \in \Delta^h_{k,j} \Rightarrow |F^{(k-1)}(s)| < (Ch)^{\delta_{k-1}} \;\text{ and }\; |F^{(k)}(s)| \ge (Ch)^{\delta_k}.$$

It is clear that the length of $\Delta^h_{k,j}$ is less than $2(Ch)^{\delta_{k-1}-\delta_k} = 2(Ch)^{\delta_0/m}$. $\triangle$

7 Appendix

Proof of Lemma 2.1. For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ we denote $\gamma^\alpha_h(x) = (\partial^\alpha\gamma)(h^{-\delta_0}x)h^{-d\delta_0}$. Further on $\alpha = \alpha' + \alpha''$ with $|\alpha''| \le 2$ and dropping the indices $\nu, \bar\nu$ we write

$$\partial^\alpha a_h(x) = \partial^{\alpha'+\alpha''} a_h(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \partial^{\alpha''} a(y)\gamma^{\alpha'}_h(x-y)h^{-\delta_0|\alpha'|}\,dy. \tag{7.1}$$

If $|\alpha| \le 2$ then it is clear that $\partial^\alpha a_h = O(1)$ follows from (7.1) with $\alpha' = 0$. Further on we assume $|\alpha| \ge 3$ and $|\alpha''| = 2$. Then $|\alpha'| \ge 1 \Rightarrow \int \gamma^{\alpha'}_h(x-y)dy = 0$ and (7.1) still holds if $\partial^{\alpha''}a(y)$ is replaced by $\partial^{\alpha''}a(y) - \partial^{\alpha''}a(x)$. Therefore

$$|\partial^\alpha a_h(x)| \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\partial^{\alpha''}a(y) - \partial^{\alpha''}a(x)||\gamma^{\alpha'}_h(x-y)|h^{-\delta_0|\alpha'|}\,dy \le$$

$$C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |y-x|^{r_0}|\gamma^{\alpha'}_h(x-y)|h^{-\delta_0|\alpha'|}\,dy \;=\; Ch^{(r_0-|\alpha'|)\delta_0}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|z|^{r_0}|\gamma^{(\alpha')}(z)|\,dz, \tag{7.2}$$

i.e. we obtain $\partial^\alpha a_h = O(h^{(r_0+2-|\alpha|)\delta_0})$ and (2.5) follows.
If $|\alpha''| = 2$ then we can estimate

$$\partial^{\alpha''}a_h(x) - \partial^{\alpha''}a(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(\partial^{\alpha''}a(y) - \partial^{\alpha''}a(x))\gamma^0_h(x-y)\,dy \tag{7.3}$$

by $O(h^{r_0\delta_0})$ similarly as the right hand side of (7.2) with $\alpha' = 0$.
In the next step we estimate (7.3) when $|\alpha''| = 1$. Since $\int y\gamma(y)\,dy = 0$, we can replace $\partial^{\alpha''}a(y) - \partial^{\alpha''}a(x)$ by

$$\partial^{\alpha''}a(y) - \partial^{\alpha''}a(x) - (y-x)\cdot\nabla\partial^{\alpha''}a(x) \tag{7.4}$$

in the right hand side of (7.3). We can express (7.4) as

$$\int_0^1 ds\,(y-x)\cdot(\nabla\partial^{\alpha''}a(x+s(y-x))-\nabla\partial^{\alpha''}a(x)), \tag{7.4'}$$

hence its absolute value is $O(|y-x|^{1+r_0})$ and

$$|\partial^{\alpha''}a_h(x)-\partial^{\alpha''}a(x)|\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|y-x|^{1+r_0}|\gamma_h^0(x-y)|\,dy\;=C_{r_0}h^{(1+r_0)\delta_0}.$$

At the beginning of Section 2 we assumed $(2+r_0)\delta_0>1$, hence it is easy to see that the proof of (2.6) will be complete if we show $a_h-a=O(h^{(2+r_0)\delta_0})$. However writing (7.3) with $\alpha''=0$ and using $\int y^\alpha\gamma(y)\,dy\;=0$ when $1\le|\alpha|\le 2$ we can replace $a(y)-a(x)$ by

$$a(y)-\sum_{|\alpha|\le 2}(y-x)^\alpha\partial^\alpha a(x)/\alpha!=$$

$$\sum_{|\alpha|=2}(y-x)^\alpha\int_0^1 ds\,2(1-s)\,(\partial^\alpha a(x+s(y-x))-\partial^\alpha a(x))/\alpha!.$$

Since the last expression is $O(|y-x|^{2+r_0})$, we obtain

$$|a_h(x)-a(x)|\le C\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|y-x|^{2+r_0}|\gamma_h^0(x-y)|\,dy\;=C'_{r_0}h^{(2+r_0)\delta_0}.$$

The proof of the assertion b) is described in Appendix of [24].

Proof of Lemma 2.2. Due to (2.7) and the min-max principle, it suffices to show that (1.5) holds with $\mathcal{N}(P_h^\pm,E)$ instead of $\mathcal{N}(A_h,E)$. We drop ± and we observe that it suffices to prove

$$\mathcal{N}(P_h,E)=(2\pi h)^{-d}c_E^h+O(h^{-d})\mathcal{R}_E^{\varepsilon,a_0}(h). \tag{7.5}$$

where $c_E^h=\mathrm{vol}\,\{v\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}:\,\hat p_h(v)\le E\}$. Indeed, due to (2.6) one has

$$|c_E^h-c_E|\le\mathrm{vol}\,\{v\in\mathbb{R}^{2d}:\,|a_0(v)-E|\le Ch\}\le C_\varepsilon\mathcal{R}_E^{\varepsilon,a_0}(h).$$

Let $g\in C_0^\infty(]E-c;\;E+c[)$, $l_h=g^2\circ\hat p_h$ and $L_h=l_h(x,hD)$. Then reasoning as in Section 3 of [24] we find $||g^2(P_h)-L_h||_{\mathrm{tr}}=O(h^{1-d})$ and combining this estimate with (2.11) we have

$$\mathrm{tr}\;(g^2\tilde f_h^Z)(P_h)\;=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}}\frac{dv}{(2\pi h)^d}\,(g^2\tilde f_h^Z)(\hat p_h(v))\;+O(h^{-d})\sum_{1\le j\le 2}\mathcal{R}_{E_j}^{\varepsilon/2,a_0}(h) \tag{7.6}$$

if $Z = [E_1;\ E_2] \subset [E-c;\ E+c]$. Next we observe that

$$|(\tilde{f}_h^Z - \mathbb{1}_Z)(\lambda)| \leq C_N \sum_{1\leq j\leq 2} \left(1 + \frac{|\lambda - E_j|}{h}\right)^{-N} \tag{7.7}$$

holds for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$, hence reasoning as in Section 4 we obtain

$$(2\pi h)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (g^2(\tilde{f}_h^Z - \mathbb{1}_Z))\circ\hat{p}_h = O(h^{-d}) \sum_{1\leq j\leq 2} \mathcal{R}_{E_j}^{\varepsilon/2, a_0}(h). \tag{7.8}$$

Taking $Z = [E';\ E'+h] \subset [E-c;\ E+c]$ we obtain

$$(2\pi h)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (g^2 \tilde{f}_h^{[E';\ E'+h]})\circ\hat{p}_h = O(h^{-d}) \mathcal{R}_{E'}^{\varepsilon/2, a_0}(h). \tag{7.9}$$

Indeed, due to (7.8) it suffices to observe that (7.9) holds if $\tilde{f}_h^{[E';\ E'+h]}$ is replaced by $\mathbb{1}_{[E';\ E'+h]}$. As a consequence of (7.6) and (7.9) we find

$$\mathrm{tr}\ (g^2 \tilde{f}_h^{[E';\ E'+h]})(P_h) = O(h^{-d}) \mathcal{R}_{E'}^{\varepsilon/2, a_0}(h). \tag{7.10}$$

We assume moreover $g \geq 0$ and $g = 1$ in a neighbourhood of E. Let $\tilde{g} \in C_0^\infty(]-\infty;\ E[)$ satisfy $\tilde{g} + g^2 = 1$ on $[\min\{\inf \hat{p}_h, \inf \sigma(P_h)\};\ E]$. Then

$$c_E^h = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \tilde{g}\circ\hat{p}_h + \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (g^2 \mathbb{1}_{[E-c;\ E]})\circ\hat{p}_h, \tag{7.11}$$

$$\mathcal{N}(P, E) = \mathrm{tr}\, \tilde{g}(P_h) + \mathrm{tr}\, (g^2 \mathbb{1}_{[E-c;\ E]})(P_h). \tag{7.12}$$

However reasoning as in Section 3 of [24] we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}\, \tilde{g}(P_h) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} \tilde{g}\circ\hat{p}_h + O(h^{1-d}), \tag{7.13}$$

hence in order to obtain (7.5) it suffices to show

$$\mathrm{tr}\ (g^2 \mathbb{1}_{[E-c;\ E]})(P_h) = (2\pi h)^{-d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d}} (g^2 \mathbb{1}_{[E-c;\ E]})\circ\hat{p}_h + O(h^{-d}) \mathcal{R}_E^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h) \tag{7.14}$$

and due to (7.6), (7.8), it is clear that (7.14) follows from

$$\mathrm{tr}\ (g^2(\tilde{f}_h^{[E-c;\ E]} - \mathbb{1}_{[E-c;\ E]}))(P_h) = O(h^{-d}) \mathcal{R}_E^{\varepsilon, a_0}(h). \tag{7.15}$$

To begin the proof of (7.15) we observe that modulo $O(h^\infty)$ we can estimate the left hand side of (7.15) by

$$\operatorname{tr} g^2(P_h)\left(1+\frac{|P_h-E|}{h}\right)^{-N} \le \sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} \frac{2\operatorname{tr}(g^2\mathbb{1}_{[E+kh;\,E+(k+1)h]})(P_h)}{(1+\min\{|k|,\,|k+1|\})^N} \tag{7.16}$$

due to (7.7) and clearly the contribution of $\sum_{|k|\ge h^{-\varepsilon/2}}$ is $O(h^{\varepsilon N/2-d})$.
Next we observe that $\tilde\gamma_1>0$ allows us to find a constant $C_0>0$ such that $\mathbb{1}_{[E';\,E'+h]}\le C_0\tilde f_h^{[E';\,E'+h]}$, hence the contribution of $\sum_{|k|<h^{-\varepsilon/2}}$ in the right hand side of (7.16) can be estimated by

$$C\sup_{|k|<h^{-\varepsilon/2}}\operatorname{tr}(g^2\tilde f_h^{[E+kh;\,E+(k+1)h]})(P_h)\le C_\varepsilon h^{-d}\sup_{|k|<h^{-\varepsilon/2}}\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon/2,a_0}_{E+kh}(h) \tag{7.17}$$

due to (7.10). It is clear that (7.17) can be estimated by $O(h^{-d})\mathcal{R}^{\varepsilon,a_0}_E(h)$. △

References

[1] M. Bronstein and V. Ivrii, Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients I, Pushing the limits, *Comm. Part. Diff. Eq.* **28** (2003), 99–123.

[2] R. Brummelhuis, T. Paul and A. Uribe, Spectral estimate near a critical level, *Duke Math. J.* **78(3)** (1995), 477–530.

[3] B. Camus, *Formule des traces semi-classique au niveau d'une énergie critique*, Thèse de l'Univeristé de Reims (2001).

[4] B. Camus, A semiclassical trace formula at a non-degenerate critical level, *J. Funct. Anal.* **208(2)** (2004), 446–481.

[5] B. Camus, A semiclassical trace formula at a totally degenerate critical level, Contributions of local extremum, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **247** (2004), 513–526.

[6] B. Camus, Contribution of non-extremum critical points to the semiclassical trace formula, *J. Funct. Anal.* **217** (2004), 79–102.

[7] J. Chazarain, Spectre d'un hamiltonien quantique et mécanique classique, *Comm. Partial Diff. Eq.* **5** (1980), 595–644.

[8] M. Combescure, J. Ralston, D. Robert, A proof of the Gutzwiller semi-classical trace formula using coherent states decomposition, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **202(2)** (1999), 463–480.

[9] M. Dimassi, J. Sjöstrand, *Spectral asymptotics in the semiclassical limit*, London math.Society Lecture Note Series 268, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999.

[10] B. Helffer, D. Robert, Comportement semi-classique du spectre des hamiltoniens quantiques elliptiques, *Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble* **31 (3)** (1981), 169–223.

[11] B. Helffer, D. Robert, Calcul fonctionnel par la transformation de Mellin et opérateurs admissibles, *J. Funct. Anal.* **53 (3)** (1983), 246–268.

[12] L. Hörmander, The spectral function of an elliptic operator, *Acta Math.* **121** (1968), 173–218.

[13] L. Hörmander, On the asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues of the pseudodifferential operators in $\mathbb{R}^d$, *Ark. Mat.* **17** (1979), 297–313.

[14] L. Hörmander, *The analysis of linear partial differential operators*, Springer-Verlag, vol. 1, 2, 3, 4, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York-Tokyo, 1983, 1985.

[15] V. Ivrii, *Microlocal analysis and precise spectral asymptotics*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[16] V. Ivrii, Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients, *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* (2000), 1155–1166.

[17] V. Ivrii, Sharp spectral asymptotics for operators with irregular coefficients II, Domains with Boundaries and Degenarations, *Comm. Part. Diff. Eq. 28* (2003), 103–128.

[18] D. Khuat-Duy, A semiclasical trace formula at a critical level, *J. Funct. Anal.* **146(2)** (1997), 299-351.

[19] S. Z. Levendorskii, *Asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues of differential operators,* Math. and its Appl., Kluwer, Dordrecht, 1990.

[20] T. Paul, A. Uribe, The semiclassical trace formula and propagation of wave packets, *J. Funct. Anal.* **132** (1995), 192–249.

[21] D. Robert, *Autour de l'approximation semi-classique*, Progress in Math. 68, Birkhäuser, Boston 1987.

[22] M. A. Shubin, V. A., Tulovskii, On the asymptotic distribution of eigenvalues of pseudodifferential operators in $\mathbb{R}^d$, *Math. USRR-Sb* **21** (1973), 565–573.

[23] L. Zielinski, Semiclassical distribution of eigenvalues for elliptic operators with Hölder continuous coefficients I: Non-critical case, *Coll. Math.* **99** (2004), 157–174.

[24] L. Zielinski, Semiclassical Weyl formula for elliptic operators with non-smooth coefficients, *Operator Theory: Adv. and Appl.* **153** (2005), 321–344.

[25] L. Zielinski, Semiclassical distribution of eigenvalues for elliptic operators with Hölder continuous coefficients II: Critical case, *Operator Theory* **20** (2006), 261–274.

[26] L. Zielinski, Semiclassical Weyl formula for weakly regular elliptic operators, *Math. Phys. Anal. and Geom.* **9** (2006), 1–21.

[27] L. Zielinski, Sharp semiclassical estimates of the number of eigenvalues below a totally degenerate critical level, to be published in *J. Funct. Anal.*